TTAB

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE TRADEMARK AND TRIAL APPEAL BOARD

----X

In re Application of: V Technologies International

Corporation

App. Ser. No.: 75/833293

Filed: May 11, 2000

Mark: AGILQUEST

TO: Assistant Commissioner for Trademarks

Box TTAB/NO FEE 2900 Crystal Drive

Arlington, Virginia 22202-3513

06-05-2003
U.S. Patent & TMOtc/TM Mail Rcpt Dt. #22

Trademark Trial and Appeal Board

Motion to Dismiss Appeal and Remand to the Examining Attorney.

Pursuant to TBMP §§ 1212 and 1213, Applicant and Appellant V Technologies

International Corporation ("V Technologies"), by counsel, hereby moves that the Trademark

Trial and Appeal Board ("TTAB") dismiss the Subject Appeal and remand consideration of the

Subject Application to the Examining Attorney. V Technologies requests that the TTAB date

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Trademarks, Box TTAB/NO FEE, 2900 Crystal Drive, Arlington, Virginia 22202-3513, on June 4, 2003.

Christopher J. Mugel

Linutifh

Date of Signature: 6/1/2003

stamp and return the enclosed pre-addressed, postage prepaid postcard to acknowledge its receipt of this motion.

As its ground for this Motion, V Technologies states that the prior registration cited by the Examining Attorney as the sole basis for her final refusal, specifically prior Registration Number 1,972,552, owned by Qualcomm and identifying the mark QUEST (the "'552 Registration"), has since been cancelled for the Registrant's failure to file a Section 8 affidavit. As evidence of such cancellation of the blocking registration, V Technologies attaches as Exhibit A to this motion a print out of the TESS abstract of the '552 Registration, stating same to have been cancelled on February 8, 2003. See Exhibit A. As a result, the ground for the final refusal is no longer present, and the Subject Appeal is moot. Since the only basis for withholding a notice of allowance was the now-cancelled prior registration, upon remand to the Examining Attorney, the Subject Application should be allowed for publication.

TBMP § 1213 states, "[w]hen proceedings have been suspended, at the request of the applicant, in an ex-parte appeal to the Board, and the event for which proceedings have been suspended occurs ... the applicant should file a paper notifying the Board thereof and requesting that further appropriate action be taken in the appeal." TBMP § 1213.

TBMP Section 1212 expressly contemplates that the TTAB should dismiss and remand in circumstances such as this:

If, during the pendency of an <u>ex parte</u> appeal involving a refusal to register under Section 2(d) of the Act, the cited registration is cancelled, or is assigned to the applicant, the appeal will be moot insofar as that issue is concerned. If the refusal to register on the basis of the cancelled or assigned registration is the only issue involved in the appeal, the Board will dismiss the appeal as moot, and the application will be sent to the Trademark Examining Attorney for approval for publication (or for registration, in the case of a Supplemental Register application). If the appeal involves additional issues, it will go forward solely on the additional issues.

TBMP § 1212. In the case of the Subject Application, the Examining Attorney issued her final refusal based solely under Section 2(d), and solely based on the '552 Registration, all other bases for refusal having been previously resolved. V Technologies therefore respectfully submits that, as a result, that the appropriate course of action now dismissal of the appeal en toto and remand of the Subject Application for approval for publication.

Appellant provides the following additional background for the general information of the Board.

Applicant/Appellant filed the Subject Application, identifying the mark AGILQUEST, on October 27, 1999. The Examining Attorney issued a Final Refusal of the Subject Application on April 2, 2001. The sole basis of the Final Refusal was Section 2(d), and the sole remaining citation in that Final Refusal was the '552 Registration. On October 2, 2001, V Technologies concurrently filed: (1) a request for reconsideration; (2) a notice of appeal; and (3) a motion for suspension of the appeal, for the latter citing as multiple grounds that (a) suspension would permit time for the examiner to entertain the request for reconsideration, and (b) that the '552 Registration would soon be due for a Section 8 filing, and that the refusal would be moot if that filing was not made. On November 20, 2001, the examining attorney issued Office Action No. 3, stating that she continued to refuse the application under Section 2(d), citing the '552 Registration, thus denying the request for reconsideration. On December 7, 2001, V Technologies filed a Renewed Request for Suspension of Appeal, again noting that a Section 8 affidavit would soon be due on the '552 Registration. On October 30, 2002, Paralegal Specialist Rochelle Ricks on behalf of the TTAB issued a notice that the Board was suspending the Subject Appeal until a determination could be made as to whether the '552 Registration should be cancelled for failure to file a Section 8 affidavit.

Based on Applicant's investigation of PTO records, no Affidavit was filed and the '552 Registration was canceled on February 8, 2002. <u>See</u> Exhibit A. Therefore, the basis for the Examiner's refusal is no longer valid.

In summary, Applicant herby notifies the Board that Registration No. 1,972,552 has been canceled by the Patent and Trademark Office and as a result that the bases for examiner's final refusal no longer is present and the Subject Appeal is moot. Accordingly, V Technology respectfully requests that the Subject Appeal be dismissed as moot, and that the Subject Application be remanded to the Examining Attorney so that the Section 2(d) refusal can be lifted and the Subject Application may be allowed for publication.

Richmond, Virginia June 4, 2003

Christopher J. Mugel

Virginia State Bar No. 26073 cmugel@leclairryan.com

Roman L. Helms.

Virginia State Bar No. 46951 rhelms@leclairryan.com

LeClair Ryan, A Professional Corporation 707 East Main Street

11th Floor

Richmond, Virginia 23219

Telephone: (804) 783-2003

Direct Dial: (804) 343-4084

Counsel for V Technologies International Corporation

cc: Sheila Marsh, Esquire

 $f:\cmugel\vech\agilquest\motdismiss remand 1.doc 6/4/2003\ 10:55\ AM$



United Styles Patent and Tradealark Office

Trademark Electronic Search System (TESS)

TESS was last updated on Wed Jun 4 04:18:49 EDT 2003

PTO HOME TRADEMARK TESS HOME NEW USER STRUCTURED FREE FORM BROWSE DICT BOTTOM

Please logout when you are done to release system resources allocated for you.

Record 1 out of 1

(TARR contains current status, correspondence address and attorney of record for this mark. Use the "Back" button of the Internet Browser to return to TESS)

Typed Drawing

Word Mark

QUEST

Goods and Services

(CANCELLED) IC 009. US 021 023 026 036 038. G & St computer software, namely electronic mail software for sending, receiving and

managing electronic mail messages. FIRST USE: 19930830. FIRST USE IN

COMMERCE: 19930930

Mark Drawing

Code

(1) TYPED DRAWING

Serial Number

74629290

Filing Date

January 31, 1995

Published for

Opposition

September 12, 1995

Registration

Number

1972552

Registration

Date

May 7, 1996

Owner

(REGISTRANT) QUALCOMM Incorporated CORPORATION DELAWARE

6455 Lusk Boulevard San Diego CALIFORNIA 92121

Assignment

Recorded

ASSIGNMENT RECORDED

Attorney of

Record

Theresa R. Willi

Type of Mark

TRADEMARK PRINCIPAL

Register Live/Dead Indicator

DEAD

EXHIBIT A

Cancellation Date

February 8, 2003

PTO HOME TRADEMARK TESS HOME NEW USER STRUCTURED FREE FORM BROWSE DICT

HELP